

CA20N
EAB
-0 53

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT BOARD



ONTARIO HYDRO DEMAND/SUPPLY PLAN HEARINGS

VOLUME: 161

DATE: Thursday, June 11, 1992

BEFORE:

HON. MR. JUSTICE E. SAUNDERS Chairman


DR. G. CONNELL Member

MS. G. PATTERSON Member

EARR
ASSOCIATES &
REPORTING INC.

(416) 482-3277

2300 Yonge St. Suite 709 Toronto, Canada M4P 1E4



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2022 with funding from
University of Toronto

<https://archive.org/details/31761114681521>

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT BOARD
ONTARIO HYDRO DEMAND/SUPPLY PLAN HEARING

IN THE MATTER OF the Environmental Assessment Act,
R.S.O. 1980, c. 140, as amended, and Regulations
thereunder;

AND IN THE MATTER OF an undertaking by Ontario Hydro
consisting of a program in respect of activities
associated with meeting future electricity
requirements in Ontario.

Held on the 5th Floor, 2200
Yonge Street, Toronto, Ontario,
Thursday, the 11th day of June,
1992, commencing at 10:00 a.m.

VOLUME 161

B E F O R E :

THE HON. MR. JUSTICE E. SAUNDERS	Chairman
DR. G. CONNELL	Member
MS. G. PATTERSON	Member

S T A F F :

MR. M. HARPUR	Board Counsel
MR. R. NUNN	Counsel/Manager, Information Systems
MS. C. MARTIN	Administrative Coordinator
MS. G. MORRISON	Executive Coordinator

A P P E A R A N C E S

B. CAMPBELL)	ONTARIO HYDRO
L. FORMUSA)	
B. HARVIE)	
J.F. HOWARD, Q.C.)	
J. LANE)	
G. A. KARISH)	
J.C. SHEPHERD)	IPPSO
I. MONDROW)	
J. PASSMORE)	
R. WATSON)	MUNICIPAL ELECTRIC
A. MARK)	ASSOCIATION
S. COUBAN)	PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT
P. MORAN)	AGENCIES
J. MacDONALD)	
C. MARLATT)	NORTH SHORE TRIBAL COUNCIL,
D. ESTRIN)	UNITED CHIEFS AND COUNCILS
H. DAHME)	OF MANITOULIN, UNION OF
		ONTARIO INDIANS
D. POCH)	COALITION OF ENVIRONMENTAL
D. STARKMAN)	GROUPS
D. ARGUE)	
T. ROCKINGHAM		MINISTRY OF ENERGY
B. KELSEY)	NORTHWATCH
L. GREENSPOON)	
P. McKAY)	
J.M. RODGER		AMPCO
M. MATTSON)	ENERGY PROBE
T. McCLENAGHAN)	
A. WAFFLE		ENVIRONMENT CANADA
M. CAMPBELL)	PUBLIC HEALTH COALITION
		(OPHA, IICPA)
G. GRENVILLE-WOOD		SESCI

A P P E A R A N C E S
(Cont'd)

D. ROGERS		ONGA
H. POCH)	CITY OF TORONTO
J. PARKINSON)	
R. POWER		CITY OF TORONTO, SOUTH BRUCE ECONOMIC CORP.
S. THOMPSON		ONTARIO FEDERATION OF AGRICULTURE
B. BODNER		CONSUMERS GAS
J. MONGER)	CAC (ONTARIO)
K. ROSENBERG)	
C. GATES)	
W. TRIVETT		RON HUNTER
M. KLIPPENSTEIN		POLLUTION PROBE
N. KLEER)	NAN/TREATY #3/TEME-AUGAMA
J. OLTHUIS)	ANISHNABAI AND MOOSE RIVER/
J. CASTRILLI)	JAMES BAY COALITION
T. HILL		TOWN OF NEWCASTLE
M. OMATSU)	OMAA
B. ALLISON)	
C. REID)	
E. LOCKERBY		AECL
C. SPOEL)	CANADIAN VOICE OF WOMEN
U. FRANKLIN)	FOR PEACE
B. CARR)	
F. MACKESY		ON HER OWN BEHALF
D. HUNTER)	DOFASCO
M. BADER)	
B. TAYLOR)	MOOSONEE DEVELOPMENT AREA
D. HORNER)	BOARD AND CHAMBER OF
H. WATSON)	COMMERCE

A P P E A R A N C E S
(Cont'd)

T. HEINTZMAN)	ATOMIC ENERGY OF CANADA
D. HAMER)	
C. FINDLAY)	
P.A. NYKANEN)	CANADIAN MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION - ONTARIO
G. MITCHELL		SOCIETY OF AECL PROFESSIONAL EMPLOYEES
S. GOUDGE		CUPE
D. COLBORNE		NIPIGON ABORIGINAL PEOPLES' ALLIANCE
R. CUYLER		ON HIS OWN BEHALF
L. BULLOCK)	CANADIAN NUCLEAR ASSOCIATION
L. CHAN)	
R. MATSUI)	
M. ANSHAN		CAESCO

I N D E X o f P R O C E E D I N G S

Page No.

<u>AMIR SHALABY,</u> <u>JOHN KENNETH SNELSON,</u> <u>JANE BERNICE TENNYSON,</u> <u>FREDERICK GEORGE LONG,</u> <u>BRIAN PAUL WILLIAM DALZIEL,</u> <u>HELEN ANNE HOWES; Resumed.</u>	28491
Cross-Examination by Ms. Spoel	28491

TIME NOTATIONS

	<u>Page No.</u>
10:03 a.m. -----	28491
10:13 a.m. -----	28497
10:25 a.m. -----	28503
10:40 a.m. -----	28511
10:55 a.m. -----	28521
11:16 a.m. -----	28533
Adjourned 11:28 a.m. -----	28539

1 ---Upon commencing at 10:03 a.m.

2 THE REGISTRAR: Please come to order.

3 This hearing is now in session. Please be seated.

4 THE CHAIRMAN: Ms. Spoel?

5 MS. SPOEL: Thank you.

6 AMIR SHALABY,
7 JOHN KENNETH SNELSON,
8 JANE BERNICE TENNYSON,
9 FREDERICK GEORGE LONG,
10 BRIAN PAUL WILLIAM DALZIEL,
11 HELEN ANNE HOWES; Resumed.

12 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MS. SPOEL:

13 Q. I think the most of my questions are
14 going to be directed to Dr. Tennyson, although there
15 may be others that are more appropriately answered by
16 others, and please do so.

17 I would like to start by asking some
18 questions about planning criteria, and for that purpose
19 perhaps you could turn to Exhibit 682, which is the
20 overheads, specifically page 16.

21 Now, the first paragraph on that page
22 lists a number of criteria which are described as
23 primary criteria which must be met for evaluating and
24 developing recommended plans, and I note that those
25 include social acceptance; is that correct?

DR. TENNYSON: A. Yes.

Q. And further, on page 19, which is the

1 DSP case and plan formulation process, can I take it
2 that the stage at which the primary criteria must be
3 met or where it's indicated test against criteria
4 between dozens of cases and cases, is that where those
5 criteria listed as a primary criteria are actually
6 brought into the process.

7 A. Perhaps Mr. Snelson would be better
8 able to answer that.

9 MR. SNELSON: A. I think the criteria
10 are brought into play throughout the process and
11 clearly some of the testing against criteria takes
12 place at that point that is indicated there, and this
13 is sort of a generalization of a rather complex process
14 that is on this chart.

15 Q. I understand that.

16 A. The primary criteria and the
17 secondary criteria are considered throughout the
18 process.

19 Q. Just taking the particular criterion
20 of social acceptance which is the one I am interested
21 in at this point, is that brought into the picture or
22 is it used as one of the tests early on in the process
23 when you are narrowing down the number of cases, as
24 would appear -- I realize that page 19 is a very simple
25 schematic drawing, but it does indicate test against

1 criteria. So am I correct in assuming that in
2 narrowing down the cases you look at social acceptance
3 as one of the criteria that you consider?

4 A. The first place in the process that
5 we are involved in here where social acceptance was a
6 very large factor was in the consultation and the
7 results of that consultation that were incorporated
8 into preparing the demand/supply planning strategy
9 itself. So that was the first and very significant
10 consultation with the public as to what sort of
11 principles we should use in our planning.

12 DR. TENNYSON: A. In addition, as I
13 indicated in my direct evidence, various government
14 agencies in the review of our studies had suggested
15 that social acceptance become one of the main criteria
16 that we used.

17 Q. I will come to the consultation part
18 of it in a minute. But are you then saying that the
19 question of determining what social acceptance is, or
20 whether that criterion has been met, is a matter for
21 public consultation alone?

22 Sorry, I will ask this in separate parts.

23 Is the public consultation process the
24 way you determined whether the criterion of social
25 acceptance had been met?

1 A. If you look at how we have
2 interpreted it, social acceptance is determined or we
3 can attempt to determine that through consultation
4 through our studies. And obviously we believe that
5 processes such as this, the environmental assessment
6 process, government review and as well hearings such as
7 this, all contribute to determining the social
8 acceptance of our plans.

9 So that as much as I would say we can use
10 it as a test in terms of developing our plans and in
11 terms of bringing them forward, clearly there are
12 processes in place that also provide a determination of
13 that.

14 Q. Okay. So you have told me that you
15 use public consultation as one of the ways of
16 determining what social acceptance is?

17 A. That's correct.

18 Q. You have also used your own studies
19 to determine what social acceptance is or whether that
20 criterion has been met?

21 A. I guess where I am referring to that
22 is that when we do our studies obviously they involve a
23 lot of consultation. But I think I would add that in
24 terms of studies there is additional information
25 provided, there is additional knowledge on both party's

1 parts perhaps through studies that would also
2 contribute to that. We also have obviously a
3 historical perspective in the sense of what has been
4 acceptable, how it is changing. We try to understand
5 changing social values in both.

6 Q. So you do some consultation and you
7 do some of your own work; is that fair?

8 A. Our work is done in consultation,
9 obviously.

10 Q. I understand that when you are
11 dealing with society that you have to do that.

12 And I am not suggesting that you should
13 only be doing public consultation. What I am trying to
14 find out is what in fact you perceive or what Hydro has
15 in fact done for this plan to determine whether that
16 criterion is met, and there is no --

17 A. Agreed, and I think our evidence on
18 various panels, particularly 6 and 7 and now this one,
19 we will be discussing this.

20 Q. Now, from your point of view, Dr.
21 Tennyson, as a member of the planning team, for you to
22 consider that the criterion of social acceptance has
23 been met, what do you need to be shown? What proof do
24 you require that that criterion has been met as set out
25 on page 16 of the overheads?

1 A. As we stated in the - what is it -
2 Exhibit No. 3, the Demand/Supply Plan report, page
3 15-53.

4 Q. I'm sorry, I don't have that
5 reference with me. Can you just tell me what it does
6 actually say as to what constitutes public social
7 acceptance?

8 A. Okay, if I can refer to it and then
9 we can elaborate if you would like.

10 THE CHAIRMAN: What page, I'm sorry, Dr.
11 Tennyson?

12 DR. TENNYSON: 15-53. And the paragraphs
13 I am referring to are social acceptance and other
14 social considerations.

15 MS. SPOEL: Q. I now have a copy so
16 perhaps I can focus.

17 DR. TENNYSON: A. Do you want me to read
18 it out then.

19 Q. Certainly?

20 A. The DSPS presents guidelines for
21 the development and evaluation of
22 demand/supply plans. These guidelines
23 incorporate the results of public
24 consultation during which Hydro gained a
25 better understanding of public values,

1 concerns and expectations. Whether
2 demand/supply plans based on the DSPS are
3 seen as socially acceptable will depend
4 on how well Hydro has taken into account
5 changing social values related to, for
6 example, environmental performance and
7 maximum achievement of preferred options,
8 that is demand management, NUGs,
9 hydraulic generation and station
10 rehabilitation, the choice of supply
11 options which is both a societal and
12 local concern. Social acceptance of
13 plans will be evaluated through the
14 environmental assessment process, which
15 will provide opportunities for public
16 input. Social acceptance and other
17 social considerations will also be an
18 important factor in siting supply
19 options.

20 [10:13 a.m.]

21 Q. Now, when you refer to the DSPS
22 Guidelines, which incorporated public results of
23 consultation, is that the consultation that is referred
24 to in Exhibit 535, which is the public government
25 review and input document?

1 A. As far as I remember, that exhibit
2 does talk about the consultation throughout our entire
3 planning period, which was started in the early 80s.
4 The feedback report that you are referring to, Exhibit
5 535, does in fact give additional information on the
6 consultation that occurred, you know, past 1989. But
7 it does have the history in it.

8 And as I said, that consultation
9 historically that led to the development of the options
10 and the discussion of the options and the development
11 of the strategy was all discussed on Panel 6; at least
12 that is my understanding. And I, in turn on this
13 panel, have tried to update that with the latest.

14 Q. Well, I am particularly concerned
15 with Hydro's understanding of public values concerns
16 and expectations, which is what you refer to on page
17 15-53 of Exhibit 3. And perhaps, and I realize there
18 is more background documentation, but perhaps we could
19 move to Exhibit 535 and go into that in somewhat more
20 detail.

21 MR. SNELSON: A. Perhaps I could just
22 add that the consultation that led to the demand/supply
23 planning strategy is explained in the greatest detail
24 in an extensive series of exhibits, which are Exhibits
25 60 through 65.

1 Q. Yes, they are. Thank you. I will
2 perhaps be referring to those for more detail if
3 necessary. But I would like to start with the more
4 general part of it first.

5 If you could perhaps turn to page 5,
6 which is the beginning of the chapter on opportunities
7 for public and government review. I take it that this
8 and the following pages summarize what we might call
9 the earlier stages of consultation for the
10 demand/supply option study and the draft demand/supply
11 planning strategy; is that correct?

12 DR. TENNYSON: A. Yes, it summarizes it,
13 that is correct.

14 Q. And I note that there were two main
15 public consultation activities on the option study, the
16 Provincial Organization Consultation Program and the
17 Regional Consultation Program Community Leaders, or
18 those were two of the main activities; is that correct?

19 A. Yes, there was the consultation with
20 70 provincial organizations and trade associations, is
21 that what you are referring to, the 300 community
22 leaders. There was also consultation with municipal
23 utilities and major customers. And in that process we
24 also considered the Select Committee on Energy Review,
25 those would be the four. But you had the two of them,

1 that is correct.

2 Q. And would you consider the ones with
3 the provincial organizations and the community leaders
4 were the ones that would most reflect the views of the
5 general public as opposed to, let's say, utilities or
6 industry for the government?

7 A. I suppose you could say that.

8 Q. Is that what they were designed for?

9 A. Well, certainly they were designed
10 for that. I just was indicating that I think any
11 consultation with utilities, and that clearly they
12 would have a perspective but they would also be
13 presenting a public perspective, as well.

14 Q. The general public to distinguish
15 from those, say, specifically concerned with their own
16 utility or their own industry.

17 A. But it still a public concern.

18 Q. I understand that. In the provincial
19 organization consultation program, I note from Exhibit
20 60 that there was a large list of groups that were
21 invited to participate.

22 A. Is this what you are referring to,
23 the 58 provincial organizations and 19 trade
24 associations that participated? Over 100 were invited.

25 Q. Right. And that is what I am

1 interested in at this point.

2 A. On page 5 and 6, yes.

3 Q. I guess my question is, perhaps
4 looking at Exhibit 60 would assist you here, there is a
5 list in Exhibit 60 of the organizations that were
6 invited and whether or not they participated and to
7 what extent. It is found as Appendix B.

8 MR. SNELSON: A. Do you have a page
9 reference?

10 Q. The pages aren't numbered past the
11 main body of the document.

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. It goes to page 8 of text and then
14 there is an Appendix A, which is about four pages, and
15 then Appendix B.

16 THE CHAIRMAN: What exhibits are we
17 talking about?

18 MS. SPOEL: This is Exhibit 60, which is
19 the consultation process.

20 THE CHAIRMAN: Where are we at now?

21 MS. SPOEL: Appendix B has a lengthy list
22 of organizations and the first column indicates whether
23 they participated further, or not.

24 THE CHAIRMAN: Just wait until I find it.

25 MS. SPOEL: It is about 15 pages in.

1 THE CHAIRMAN: All right.

2 MS. SPOEL: Q. I take, Dr. Tennyson,
3 that this is the list of organizations that were
4 invited to participate and then the second column
5 indicates whether they participated, or not?

6 DR. TENNYSON: A. I suspect that is the
7 case, yes.

8 Q. And on page 5 of the document, the
9 same exhibit.

10 A. Of this list, you are talking about?

11 Q. The same exhibit, page 5 of the
12 exhibit in the text. I don't want to go through every
13 organization that participated. I am interested in how
14 the list was developed. The third paragraph on page 5
15 indicates that the list of organizations was developed
16 from those who have been involved with Hydro in the
17 past, those known to have an interest in Hydro affairs
18 and organizations potentially affected by demand or
19 supply options. The organizations invited to
20 participate represent a broad cross-section of
21 interests including agriculture, resources, industry,
22 environment, energy, religion, recreation and Native
23 people.

24 Was there any attempt to involve any
25 women's organizations?

1 A. I don't know.

2 Q. Was Voice of Women asked to
3 participate at this particular stage?

4 A. I have no idea. I must say, I mean,
5 part of that is that I was not even, I don't think I
6 was with Ontario Hydro at this point. So I really
7 don't know. I think we will have to take it that this
8 is the rationale and this was the attempt that was
9 made.

10 [10:25 a.m.]

11 Q. I will ask this question, I
12 understand that you may not have the information now,
13 but was Hydro aware that Voice of Women had been
14 extensively involved with the Porter Commission and
15 other Hydro activities over a long period of time?

16 A. I can't answer that, perhaps someone
17 else can.

18 MR. SNELSON: A. I can't answer it
19 either, I'm sorry.

20 Q. Now, if I can move back to Exhibit
21 535 and ask a couple of questions about the regional
22 consultation program with community leaders. And for
23 this purpose you may want also to refer to Exhibit 63
24 since that includes more detail.

25 I note that from the summary, it says

1 that invitations were sent by community leaders on
2 Ontario Hydro's behalf. Can I take it from that that
3 the selection of those that participated was up to
4 someone identified by Ontario Hydro as a community
5 leader in each location?

6 DR. TENNYSON: A. That's my
7 understanding, I think the rationale being that people
8 that are knowledgeable and have been activity involved
9 in their local communities and regional area would then
10 be able to indicate and involve appropriate people. I
11 think it was the fact that Ontario Hydro would not
12 necessarily know who in the regional area might want to
13 be involved or who the right representatives would be
14 and it was felt that the local people would know
15 better.

16 Q. And were the local community leaders
17 who were asked to extend these invitations asked to
18 involve those people listed here who have interest in
19 agriculture, business, the environment, women's issue,
20 labour, social welfare and other public affairs?

21 A. Yes. I might add, and it's been
22 pointed out to me, if this is helpful, I understand all
23 during this consultation there were newspaper ads
24 asking for anyone that wanted to come forward and
25 participate.

1 Certainly the whole intent was to get as
2 broad a participation as possible to involve all people
3 who were interested in the whole issue and would
4 represent this broad-based concern.

5 So, when you say if certain groups
6 weren't -- specifically, I think there were
7 opportunities and that it was known that this was going
8 on. As I say, we did advertise for any additional
9 participation.

10 Q. Did Hydro attempt to assess following
11 this exercise whether or not the groups that they had
12 requested had in fact been adequately represented in
13 the process?

14 A. Had the groups been adequately... We
15 don't much determine who represents groups, but go
16 ahead.

17 Q. Let's take some examples from here.
18 Did Ontario Hydro review the list of participants to
19 determine whether, for example, there were participants
20 who had interests in agriculture, who had interests in
21 business, who had interests in the environment, who had
22 interests in women's issues, labour and so on?

23 A. Not my knowledge. My knowledge is
24 that these meetings were held, representatives from
25 Hydro were there and I have seen reports, they are well

1 documented who attended, what the issues were, what
2 came out of it.

3 I think that in terms of consultation we
4 are asking the people what they think and I think those
5 views were reported back to the Corporation.

6 Q. Well, perhaps we could turn to
7 Exhibit 63 and have a look at who did participate in
8 this exercise. There is a list of attendees, or it
9 purports to be a list of attendees.

10 A. Yes.

11 Q. And it's found at exhibit -- sorry,
12 Appendix A, which follows page 37 of this exhibit. And
13 in particular, without going through all of them,
14 perhaps we could look at the attendees in Winchester
15 which is on page 7 of that.

16 THE CHAIRMAN: Winchester?

17 MS. SPOEL: Winchester. It's on page 7
18 of Appendix A.

19 Q. I am I correct in noting, Dr.
20 Tennyson, that there are no women on that list? I
21 suppose A. Tremblay doesn't have a Mr. or Ms.

22 DR. TENNYSON: A. Other than A.
23 Tremblay, they all appear to be Misters.

24 Q. And would it be fair to say, glancing
25 down this list, that the municipalities are very well

1 represented, the industry is very well represented, and
2 there are some agricultural representatives, but there
3 don't appear to be any from labour, social groups with
4 social concerns, social welfare, environmental or
5 women's groups? From the information that is on this
6 list, would that be a fair assessment?

7 A. Yes. I think that as well there is
8 the District High School, I mean, if we want to be
9 complete, but there is agricultural and there are
10 municipalities.

11 I guess I could also comment that all we
12 can do is ask people to participate, who in fact
13 decides to participate is what is reflected on this
14 list, and this one may not be similar to others. I
15 think Ms. Howes can add something there.

16 MS. HOWES: A. I was just go to add that
17 I have done some work on projects in the Winchester
18 area and some of these people are familiar to me. Some
19 of these elected representatives, although they may
20 represent the Township, are very active in their
21 communities and have broad ranges of interests. So
22 what you may find is the person who represents the
23 Township also is the member of the 4H Club, et cetera.
24 So because they may have one representation does not
25 necessarily mean that they don't have other roles

1 within the community.

2 Q. Thank you. Well, if we look at
3 Chatham which is right below that, it appears to me
4 that there is one woman on that list, that's Reverend
5 Elizabeth Chapman from the United Church of Canada.

6 THE CHAIRMAN: There is one more.

7 MS. SPOEL: I am sorry, it goes onto the
8 next page, I beg your pardon, there is a Mrs. Diane
9 Brown as well. And Cedar Springs I know is a place,
10 not an affiliation, so her particular affiliation or
11 interest is isn't noted on the list.

12 Q. But is that fair again that out of
13 that entire group there are two women, and again nobody
14 from any labour organizations, but many business and
15 electrical utility representatives?

16 DR. TENNYSON: A. There are some, but
17 once again there is people from the College, there is
18 people from the Church, people from the Federation of
19 Agriculture. I think it is safe to say there is a mix
20 their.

21 Q. Well, you will agree that there are
22 five from the public utilities commissions, and yet
23 this is not your utilities consultation program, that
24 is a separate consultation. This is your regional
25 consultation; is that correct?

1 A. That's correct. And I can only say
2 once again that local people invited those that they
3 thought would be, I assume, helpful.

4 Q. Now, apart from asking the
5 participants themselves whether they thought that a
6 diverse range of views was represented at the meetings,
7 which I understand was one of the questions asked in a
8 questionnaire given as follow up, other than asking the
9 participants themselves of whom it appears 87 per cent
10 said that they felt there was a diverse range of views,
11 was there any other follow-up study to indicate whether
12 or not there was a proper representation at those
13 meetings or a cross-sectional representation of Ontario
14 society?

15 A. Not that I know of.

16 Q. Would it surprise you to find that 13
17 per cent who thought that there was not proper
18 representation stated the need for more labour, women
19 and native groups to be involved?

20 A. That would not surprise me, but one
21 again I know that in certain centres people were
22 invited to participate, and if they didn't, then once
23 again, I don't think there is much we can do about
24 that.

25 Q. You haven't provided a list of those

1 who were invited but declined the invitation as you
2 have in your other study?

3 A. No.

4 THE CHAIRMAN: I want to make sure, Dr.
5 Tennyson, I am just looking at page 3 of this Exhibit
6 63, 2.2, the meeting format, and I thought I heard you
7 say that in addition to the invitees there was also an
8 opportunity for the public to attend the meetings, but
9 that doesn't seem to be clear from this document. Was
10 there an opportunity for the public to attend these
11 meetings?

12 DR. TENNYSON: No, there weren't public
13 to attend... But there was advertisement of the
14 meeting and people could be asked to be invited to the
15 meeting.

16 THE CHAIRMAN: I see. That's not set out
17 in the meeting format report.

18 DR. TENNYSON: No, but I recall these
19 particular series of meetings and I do recall the way
20 in which community leaders were invited to this
21 particular meeting.

22 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

23 MS. SPOEL: Q. Now, I take it that the
24 next stage at which Ontario Hydro did a major public
25 consultation exercise was the feedback program on the

1 actual Demand/Supply Plan hearing.

2 DR. TENNYSON: A. Excuse me, you said
3 that the next stage of it was that?

4 Q. The next stage of a public -- sorry,
5 let me go back a stage.

6 After the preparation of the
7 demand/supply options study in which the values, the
8 public values concerns and expectations were
9 determined, or during the course of which Ontario Hydro
10 attempted to determine what they were, the next stage
11 was the preparation of the draft demand/supply planning
12 strategy; is that correct?

13 MR. SNELSON: A. Yes, that's correct

14 Q. And the consultation and review of
15 that included, it would appear from Exhibit 535,
16 although if there is anything that is not in here I
17 would appreciate your telling me that, there were
18 employee presentations, utility presentations, there
19 was an Electricity Planning Technical Advisory Panel
20 and review by government ministries and a Select
21 Committee on Energy. Was that the review at that stage
22 of the process?

23 [10:40 a.m.]

24 DR. TENNYSON: A. That's correct. And I
25 would just like to point out that I would consider the

1 Select Committee on Energy to incorporate a public
2 review. I think you said public input, and I consider
3 there would be public input in that hearing.

4 Q. Thank you. Then I take it that the
5 next input or next initiative by Ontario Hydro to
6 determine broad general public as opposed to
7 legislative or utility or employee concerns was the
8 information centres and feedback program after the
9 Demand/Supply Plan was released; is that correct?

10 A. That's correct.

11 MR. SNELSON: A. I think one should be
12 aware that the Select Committee on Energy did invite
13 participation from many, many people to their hearing
14 process and that many organizations and individuals did
15 appear and present oral testimony to the Select
16 Committee or did present written submissions to the
17 Select Committee.

18 Q. Yes, I understand. I am trying to
19 focus for purpose of this examination on activities by
20 Ontario Hydro itself, and specifically, in order to
21 narrow the scope of things a bit, specifically the ones
22 involving efforts by Ontario Hydro to find out what
23 broad general concerns were.

24 A. We did place a lot of weight on the
25 Select Committee report and recommendations, and we did

1 analyze and go over the inputs to the Select Committee
2 as being representative of some aspects of public
3 opinion to take into account in the review of strategy.

4 Q. If you could turn to page 10 of
5 Exhibit 535, which is under the heading 3.5 Demand
6 Management. I understand this chapter is a summary of
7 the issues and concerns that were identified as a
8 result of your consultation activities to date, to that
9 date.

10 DR. TENNYSON: A. Chapter 3 is entitled:
11 Issues and Concerns Identified in the DSOS and DSPS.

12 Q. So that is prior to the preparation
13 of the Demand/Supply Plan.

14 A. These are the things we have been
15 talking about, these activities, yes.

16 Q. There is a comment halfway down the
17 page on the last column of page 10. It says that
18 Ontario Hydro concluded that:

19 Customers want a range of voluntary
20 rather than mandatory programs that will
21 not require lifestyle adjustments and
22 will result in a fair sharing of costs
23 and benefits. To meet longer term needs
24 there should be emphasis on demand
25 management before commitments are made to

1 supply options.

2 Was anyone asked by Ontario Hydro to
3 rank, at that stage was anybody asked to rank the
4 relative importance of lifestyle adjustments as
5 compared to environmental degradation or nuclear energy
6 facilities being built?

7 A. Not to my knowledge. Certainly not
8 in terms of, I suspect, a ranking. Certainly those are
9 the kinds of issues that were discussed throughout the
10 80s.

11 Q. After you produced a Demand/Supply
12 Plan and held the public information centres, there was
13 a questionnaire prepared for people to fill out if they
14 had been to the public information centre; is that
15 correct?

16 A. That is correct.

17 Q. And on that questionnaire you did ask
18 people to rank the relative importance of a number of
19 items; is that correct?

20 A. That is my understanding, yes.

21 Q. Was that the first time that Ontario
22 Hydro asked people to make the difficult decisions
23 involved in ranking a number of issues which might all
24 be important to them?

25 A. It certainly wouldn't be in terms of

1 trying to get a sense of priorities and rate or rank.
2 Certainly in most of Hydro's projects we do a sort of
3 importance to avoid ratings and things like that. So
4 it is certainly not the first time. But if you are
5 talking about in terms of this planning strategy, to my
6 knowledge it would be. But I am not entirely sure of
7 that.

8 Q. Perhaps we could look at the rankings
9 of various priorities by turning to the actual
10 questionnaire, which is the back of Exhibit 535, and
11 the results which require unfortunately some flipping
12 back and forth because the results and the
13 questionnaire are not in the same place. The results
14 follow the questionnaire in appendix 4. The
15 questionnaire is appendix 3, which is page 51 and page
16 69, the questionnaire and the actual results.

17 The first question, which is at page 52,
18 asks people to rank or to state the importance, I'm
19 sorry, of six factors, including a mix, demand
20 management/conservation/energy efficiency and new power
21 generation. And then within new power generation, to
22 have a balance of power generating technologies. Then,
23 I guess, three, what you might call natural
24 environmental concerns, reducing acid gas, carbon
25 dioxide, and radioactive emissions and nuclear waste.

1 And then minimizing overall cost.

2 Now, is it correct, Dr. Tennyson, that
3 over 80 per cent of people ranked all six of those as
4 very important or somewhat important? The results are
5 on page 68. Somewhat important.

6 A. Of those that responded to the
7 questionnaire, yes.

8 Q. Of course, those who responded to the
9 questionnaire, yes.

10 A. You have got over 80 per cent, yes.

11 Q. And in fact, less than 10 per cent
12 ranked any of them as not very important or not
13 important at all.

14 A. That's correct.

15 Q. So if you simply ask people what's
16 important, they are going to say everything is
17 important. If you give them a list of things, are
18 these things important, in the best of all possible
19 worlds, they are going to say that it is important to
20 have low cost and to keep the environment clean and to
21 provide a mix and so on

22 A. I don't agree. I think you can ask
23 questions and people will honestly answer whether they
24 think something is important, or not.

25 Q. But the results of this questionnaire

1 show that people did think that these were all
2 important.

3 A. These are all important. And I think
4 partly to explain that is because these kinds of issues
5 were determined. In a sense, I mean, you know that
6 these are issues throughout the consultation that has
7 occurred. And we thought they were priority issues, I
8 think, and so, therefore, you ask the questions and
9 yes, in fact it corroborates that yes, these are all
10 very important issues to the public.

11 Q. You have identified some concerns
12 that you perceived to be of importance to the public
13 and you are asking the public to confirm --

14 A. No, I don't perceive them. The
15 public has told us throughout many years of
16 consultation what are important. All I am pointing out
17 is that if you design a questionnaire and you have
18 categories of responses, I think that you will find
19 that that is trying to say, look, we think these are
20 important things, too. How important do you think they
21 are?

22 Q. So the purpose of this questionnaire
23 was to determine whether the public agreed with you
24 that these things were important, not to determine what
25 the public really thought.

1 A. I did not say that. I did not say
2 that. There are open-ended questions that ask for
3 other concerns.

4 If we want to get into questionnaire
5 design, I am just saying that we have number of
6 questions trying to elicit what is important, what
7 isn't, what priorities are.

8 Q. If we could move on perhaps to the
9 next question which asks people to rank their answers
10 to the first question, one through six, will you agree
11 with me that the results of those questions, as shown
12 on page 68, would indicate that the highest rankings,
13 in general, were given to reducing emissions to the
14 environment and including a mix of demand management
15 and new supply and that the lowest rankings were given
16 to minimizing the overall cost and to have a balance of
17 generation technologies?

18 A. In terms of, are you saying which one
19 came out number one or are you combining one and two?
20 What are you doing?

21 Q. I don't know how you analyze this
22 statistically. It is not my questionnaire. But it
23 would appear to me since 41 per cent ranked minimizing
24 overall cost as number six, that that presumably was
25 the least important to the most number of people.

1 A. If that is how you are reading it,
2 yes, I would agree with you.

3 Q. How would you interpret the results
4 of this table?

5 A. Oh, no. You worded the question
6 differently to start with. You said most, and I was
7 trying to do the adding of one and two. But in general
8 I agree with you.

9 I think we have given the results of our
10 analysis in this document. I have presented the
11 results that Hydro understood from the results of this
12 questionnaire in my direct evidence.

13 Q. Was anyone asked whether demand
14 management and conservation were important in the
15 absence, separately from asking them whether it was
16 important as part of a mix together with new power
17 generation?

18 A. If you are asking on this
19 questionnaire, I would have to go through them. I
20 mean, you must know the answer. I assume it isn't one
21 of the questions.

22 Q. It is not a question.

23 A. Well, what I am trying to get to is
24 when we went out in all of this consultation activity,
25 we had the centres. We asked people to fill out the

1 questionnaire. But we also spoke and discussed
2 numerous topics and got a lot of -- in fact, demand
3 management from the centres I attended was one of the
4 things that the public, to my understanding from being
5 there, was very, very important and they were very,
6 very interested in and talked about what they could do.
7 And certainly we would ask in our discussions and that
8 would be fed back, as well, how people viewed one
9 option versus another. This is just one component,
10 okay, of the program.

11 Q. Now, I note in your analysis of the
12 results you discounted or did not include for the
13 purposes of this documentation the questionnaires that
14 were filled out by employees of Ontario Hydro.

15 A. I don't think we didn't include them.

16 Q. Did you remove those who were the
17 spouses, children, or parents of employees of Ontario
18 Hydro?

19 A. I don't know. I would doubt it, but
20 I don't know.

21 Q. It would appear to me that the
22 questionnaire does not ask people what their age,
23 gender, income bracket, or any other demographic
24 information other than their name and address. It is
25 not in the questionnaire. I wonder if that information

1 was gathered in any other way.

2 A. Not to my knowledge.

3 Q. The questionnaires, I understand,
4 varied from a general questionnaire that was
5 distributed everywhere with some more specific
6 questions if it was near a potential site identified in
7 the Demand/Supply Plan documents or if it was a
8 location of an existing Ontario Hydro facility.

9 A. Those were illustrative sites. But
10 yes, in any of the areas that sites had been mentioned
11 we did ask additional questions.

12 Q. With respect to the sites where there
13 are existing sites in a community, did Ontario Hydro
14 attempt to determine which of the respondents were
15 people had who had moved to that community as a result
16 of Ontario Hydro being located there; for example,
17 spouses, children, other relatives of Ontario Hydro
18 employees, and those who had lived in the community
19 before the Ontario Hydro facility was located there?
20 [10:55 a.m.]

21 A. Not to my knowledge.

22 Q. In assessing the results of these
23 questionnaires, was there any attempt to weight the
24 responses, to give some kind of weighting to the
25 distribution around the Province of Ontario in terms of

1 population?

2 In other words, were they rated in any
3 way in the way of proportionality to the number in the
4 north versus the south, east, west, particular
5 communities being over or under represented in the
6 responses to the questionnaires?

7 A. No.

8 Q. There is a table on page 22 and 23 of
9 the exhibit which appears to indicate the number of
10 people who visited each information centre on the
11 particular dates and the number of questionnaires that
12 were returned.

13 Can you explain to me why from February
14 19th to 23rd in Cornwall and Vankleek Hill, while 351
15 came no questionnaires were returned? Did someone
16 forget to take them?

17 A. No.

18 Q. Obviously would you agree that 351
19 was a fairly good turn out for one of your information
20 centres?

21 A. Yes.

22 Q. Did it surprise you that nobody
23 returned a completed questionnaire from that location?

24 A. If you are asking me personally, I
25 would not have the knowledge.

1 Would it surprise Hydro? I think that
2 obviously when we ask people to fill out questionnaires
3 we always hope that they will. If people chose not
4 to...

5 I guess what I want to point out once
6 again, and I know you are focussing on the
7 questionnaire, and that is fine. At these centres,
8 again, the questionnaire, we ask people to fill out, it
9 would be a source of information. But as well we had
10 lengthy discussions with the people that attended and
11 there were people from the various areas of the
12 corporation, there were system planners, there were the
13 corporate relations people, consultation types like me.
14 There were environmental scientists, there were demand
15 management people there, all wanting to and discussing
16 the various options and discussing the plan. And at
17 the end of each session we filled out reports on what
18 the majority had said or what different people said,
19 various concerns that had been raised.

20 In this work we try to address all
21 concerns, all the concerns are important and we want to
22 have a full understanding of them. So that that
23 information, once again, there were reports done on
24 every centre that was held.

25 Q. When you say that all concerns are

1 important and you look at how many people or how often
2 they are expressed, and so on, even if it's not in a
3 statistical fashion, do you give the 2,034 people who
4 attended the centre in Elliot Lake, one-fifth of the
5 weight, if you like, of all the concerns expressed by
6 the 10,000 people who attended the information centres
7 throughout the province?

8 A. We don't weight the responses.

9 Clearly, if across the province very,
10 very large numbers of people are indicating a certain
11 value, let's say, for example, demand management has
12 always been considered very, very important. the
13 public has generally been very, very supportive
14 throughout, over time.

15 So clearly, larger and larger numbers of
16 people in general across the province that have a
17 particular view on something like demand management,
18 that lends support and tells us that that's what a vast
19 majority wants to do.

20 Q. How do you know it's a vast majority
21 if one-fifth of all the people are from one fairly
22 small town in one particular location in the province?

23 A. I didn't say that. I said that if at
24 every centre across the province and every
25 questionnaire, and don't forget we had meetings

1 throughout the regions with people. So you don't use
2 one piece of data to make an analysis. You try to get
3 many, many inputs, and clearly, if you are hearing a
4 message by the vast majority of Ontarians, I think that
5 you can make that judgment.

6 Q. When you asked people in this
7 questionnaire whether they thought the plan was
8 balanced, were you really asking them whether they
9 thought it was a good plan or whether they thought it
10 was a mixed plan?

11 A. The question asked them whether they
12 thought it was balanced.

13 Q. Why didn't you ask them whether they
14 thought it was good?

15 A. That is a good question. Perhaps
16 that is what you would have asked.

17 Q. If I could perhaps turn to the
18 supplementary witness statement which is Exhibit 646.
19 If we could turn to the tables dealing with social
20 environment, which are after financial impact and
21 environmental characteristics, comparison of options.
22 You have four criteria listed, does that mean that the
23 criterion of social acceptance is a different and
24 separate criterion from, for example, distribution of
25 risks and benefits and local community impacts and

1 employment of regional economic development, or is it
2 the summary of what those mean?

3 A. If you look at the first exhibit that
4 you referenced, the primary and secondary criteria.
5 And as I said in my direct evidence, social acceptance
6 was a criterion that was suggested by various
7 government ministries through the consultation on the
8 DSOS and DSPS, and so it is, as you know in that list,
9 a primary criterion. Under the secondary criterion in
10 that list it says other social considerations, and the
11 other social considerations for the purposes of the
12 Update, I took the criteria we had used in the
13 environmental analysis and made the three categories
14 you see. So those are the three other criteria that
15 would comprise the other considerations.

16 Q. So on this table, social acceptance
17 is a primary criterion and the other three are
18 secondary criteria?

19 A. If you want, what I am saying is that
20 if you look at the list in terms of the criteria, these
21 are of my four criteria, okay? But if you look at the
22 list that we have all been talking about, the social
23 acceptance would fall under that one and the other
24 three would comprise the other social considerations.

25 Q. And do you consider social acceptance

1 as being something different from an option which
2 maximizes the other three criteria that you have
3 identified?

4 A. Well, I don't think maximizing is a
5 word I would use. And I think the idea was that social
6 acceptance is something that is very broad, so for
7 example, there could be a belief or concern or whatever
8 about an option or about the plan, even though one
9 might think, well, it might provide a number of jobs,
10 and yes perhaps they can minimize impacts, but clearly
11 in terms of that option perhaps someone would not find
12 it acceptable.

13 So I don't see the relationship you are
14 necessarily driving.

15 Q. I am asking you whether there is a
16 relationship and I think you have answered my question
17 by saying it is something above and beyond whether --

18 A. It can be, it could be different.

19 Q. It could be different from the other
20 three criterion?

21 A. Yes.

22 Q. So something doesn't because society
23 acceptable because there is an equitable distribution
24 of risks and benefits, although that may help that to
25 be socially acceptable; is that fair.

1 A. For the public, for the people
2 involved, that may in fact be how they would build to
3 their own position on whether something is acceptable
4 or not. I can't presume that those are all the inputs
5 they would use, obviously.

6 Q. When you are considering whether
7 something is socially acceptable, you have referred to
8 it as a broad matter, obviously you can't please all
9 people all the time. Do you look alternate how people
10 generally feel about the particular option or how those
11 who are going to be most affected by the particular
12 option feel about it?

13 A. In my view, it would depend,
14 obviously. In this particular process where we are
15 talking about options and plans and we are not
16 site-specific, then clearly there is the broad public
17 concern. Some people, I would assume, and in terms of
18 when we do try to get a feeling for the acceptance of a
19 particular plan or program, may in fact be less in
20 favour of it because of any concerns that it might be
21 near them, that could be part of their determination,
22 clearly. But we do not try to judge in terms of this
23 kind of consultation, because we don't know where the
24 particular sites are.

25 Q. Now, getting away from the

1 site-specific issues, perhaps we could look at the
2 first item on the second page, which is demand
3 management, DDS, and I assume that somehow refers
4 to interruptible load, and I am afraid I can't remember
5 what DDS...

6 MR. SNELSON: A. Discount demand
7 service, but it is indeed interruptible load.

8 Q. Thank you.

9 When you have a comment here that the
10 need for reliable source of electricity is still a
11 priority for many, who, in your view, are those many?
12 Are they the industries who may be using an
13 interruptible load, or is it society as a whole?

14 DR. TENNYSON: A. The reliability issue
15 has been one that was a priority throughout this whole
16 period. It came up not just from industry, it's a
17 broad-based public concern. And, in fact, if my memory
18 is correct, in the mid-80s that was probably the number
19 one concern in terms of how often it was voiced by
20 many, meaning the many people that we consulted, and it
21 still is, and that's what this is trying to reflect.
22 And I am trying to not do a particular industry
23 perspective or whatever. This is the public
24 perspective which comprises all members of society.

25 Q. And your next comment that says

1 reasonably-priced reliable electricity is considered
2 important for the provincial economy.

3 Again, I would ask the same question, by
4 whom?

5 A. That's always been a broad-based
6 public.

7 Q. And you say that despite your most
8 recent questionnaire which would appear to indicate
9 that minimizing cost is the least important priority?

10 A. I think it would depend how you would
11 talk about minimizing cost. This is reasonably-priced
12 electricity, but in terms of the results that I spoke
13 to in my direct evidence and it's in this report, is
14 that we clearly indicated that environmental
15 considerations, for example, should be balanced in any
16 analysis with a discussion of cost. Clearly, cost
17 considerations are not to be the driver and that's what
18 this survey did show.

19 But, as I say, one input to what the
20 report findings are, are the questionnaire. And I
21 agree with you that the No. 1 priority is not
22 minimizing cost, but that doesn't stop people from
23 saying that they still think that reasonably-priced
24 electricity is important. It's the definition of
25 reasonable. It doesn't say least cost.

1 Q. The questionnaire of course doesn't
2 ask them that, does it?

3 THE CHAIRMAN: I didn't hear the
4 question, I'm sorry.

5 MS. SPOEL: Q. The questionnaire doesn't
6 ask them whether they want reasonably-priced
7 electricity. It asks them whether it's important to
8 minimize overall cost.

9 DR. TENNYSON: A. But once again you are
10 focussing on what we have drawn out of many, many
11 activities in a consultation program, and we have made
12 statements that we feel accurately reflect what we have
13 heard.

14 Now, if you want just a report
15 necessarily that just says each number of what the
16 questionnaire said, it was part of what fed into the
17 conclusions. I presented all that in my direct
18 evidence and those are what we concluded from all our
19 consultation activities.

20 Q. Dr. Tennyson, what I am trying to do
21 is I am trying to establish the basis for your
22 conclusions. I'm sorry if I am perhaps asking you the
23 wrong series of questions, but I have some documents
24 before me which describe various activities undertaken
25 by Ontario Hydro, and that provide a great deal of the

1 information in this document relates to the
2 questionnaire that was prepared by Ontario Hydro and
3 compiled by it. If that in fact was not a particularly
4 important consideration, then please tell me so and
5 tell me what information you did use to say --

6 MR. B. CAMPBELL: With respect, Mr.
7 Chairman --

8 THE CHAIRMAN: Let her finish her
9 question first and then you can comment on it. She
10 hadn't quite finished her question. It's hard for me
11 to follow what you are objecting to until I hear what
12 the question is. There is a bit of preamble to it.

13 MS. SPOEL: Q. If the results of the
14 questionnaire were not very important, then please say
15 so and we will move on to something else. But I would
16 like to know in that case what was important or how you
17 did you determine what public values were?

18 THE CHAIRMAN: I thought she answered
19 that question. The questionnaire and the answers, I
20 suppose, speak for themselves, but there are other
21 considerations as well. I don't think it follows that
22 just because on a series of issues, that the cost issue
23 was the lowest one, that that necessarily means that
24 there is not a concern in the community for
25 reasonably-priced electricity.

1 At least that is what I thought her
2 answer was. I may have misinterpreted it, I don't
3 know.

4 [11:16 a.m.]

5 MS. SPOEL: Q. Perhaps, Dr. Tennyson, I
6 will move on to something else. I have one question
7 about one of the other criteria here, the employment
8 and regional economic development criterion on the same
9 table, and that comes under the heading of non-utility
10 generation, renewable hydraulic. And under employment
11 and regional economic development it says:

12 ...see hydroelectric but less
13 employment and regional employment
14 because of smaller scale.

15 Does that mean that each project has less
16 employment because it is a smaller scale or that there
17 is less employment provided to produce the same number
18 of megawatts of electricity using that option as
19 opposed to hydroelectric?

20 DR. TENNYSON: A. In terms of the
21 hydraulic non-utility generation, we have considered
22 them to be -- they are much smaller and that is why it
23 is statement is made.

24 Q. If you were going to produce 1,000
25 megawatts using hydraulic, say, in one project by

1 Ontario Hydro or 10 megawatt projects, how would those
2 two compare in terms of employment?

3 Obviously, I would assume that each of
4 the 10 megawatt ones would provide less jobs. My
5 question is, would 10 of them provide less jobs than
6 one large one?

7 A. It could, but I don't think -- that's
8 not the point.

9 Q. That is not what you were addressing
10 here?

11 A. No, no.

12 Q. So you were looking at the size of
13 each project, not how many projects you would need?

14 A. That's correct. I mean, if you
15 wanted to argue if we did it versus a non-utility
16 generator did it in a hypothetical case and they are
17 the same size, why would there be less. Is that the
18 point?

19 Q. No. I wondered whether 10 small
20 projects make more or less jobs than one large project.
21 That's really what I wanted to know.

22 A. I think we answered that.

23 Q. The answer to that is, that is not
24 what you considered here, you are just looking at an
25 individual project, small projects have less jobs than

1 big projects.

2 A. Yes.

3 Q. And that same answer I assume would
4 apply to the others option here which indicate less
5 employment because of smaller scale?

6 A. Yes.

7 Q. Dr. Tennyson, within Ontario Hydro,
8 who determines what work is going to be undertaken on
9 the social environment criteria used in your planning
10 process?

11 A. If you are asking who, (A),
12 determines the criteria and then how we undertake our
13 work?

14 Q. Well, who determines -- sorry.

15 A. That would be my group in Ontario
16 Hydro. I am part of the corporate relations planning
17 and research department, but my group is specifically
18 the community studies section. We have a section head.
19 And over the years our group is responsible for
20 corporate consultations, so in fact we are responsible
21 for the feedback activities as we have been discussing.
22 And as well, we do all the social impact assessment
23 work, whether it is for a plan, a program, a policy,
24 project. So we, then, undertake the work.

25 Q. And who determines, is it your group

1 that determines whether this work should be done in a
2 particular case?

3 A. Whether or not it should be done?

4 Actually, we operate somewhat in a consulting mode in
5 the sense of the way Hydro works is that project teams
6 are created and moneys are released so that the various
7 contributing departments can do the work. So we do a
8 scope of work and we get a budget and we work out our
9 activities that way, if that is what you are asking.

10 Obviously, under the act, social impact
11 assessment is part of what has to be undertaken but we
12 have been doing this for a long, long time. In other
13 instances, if there is some new venture or program that
14 is being developed, our management would meet with the
15 other managers and suggest that in particular
16 circumstances we think that there should be a
17 socio-economic impact assessment done. So it is done
18 in a number of ways, how we get involved across the
19 Corporation.

20 Q. The budgets for your work generally
21 come from the project budgets that you are specifically
22 involved with, whether it be a large project like this
23 or a smaller one?

24 A. That's correct.

25 Q. Have you done any studies to evaluate

1 in a quantitative way to the extent possible in the
2 area of social impact assessment for existing
3 facilities that Hydro has undertaken, let's say, for
4 example, Bruce nuclear station?

5 A. I'm sorry, I don't think I --

6 Q. In your community impact work, has
7 Ontario Hydro done post-project evaluations of
8 community impacts or social impacts from large-scale
9 projects, for example, the Bruce nuclear station or
10 other similar ones?

11 A. Yes, we have ongoing monitoring
12 activities on many, many projects looking at what have
13 been the effects. And we do questionnaires regularly.
14 We still have committees set up that look at all, you
15 know, how it is all evolving. It is an ongoing
16 relationship. It is not just that we go in once and
17 leave. We are there for the long term. So it is an
18 ongoing relationship in terms of evaluating what
19 happened, how we are doing.

20 Q. And do you undertake any studies or
21 prepare any papers or do any other academic type of
22 work as a result of those ongoing monitoring exercises,
23 if I can call them that?

24 A. Not as much as we'd like. Certainly
25 if you look at the academic literature in social impact

1 assessment over the last 15 years, there are many
2 academics that have used Hydro's activities as in,
3 fact, models -- and, in fact, in terms of the
4 methodology in the field, the group I am in probably
5 arguably at the forefront in terms of impact management
6 and new methods. I, in fact, teach, as well.

7 Q. And have you published papers in the
8 professional literature on social impact, Ontario
9 Hydro's social impact assessment activities?

10 A. I haven't personally, but others have
11 in the group. We actively attend conferences and are
12 part of organizations, the International Association
13 for Impact Assessment. So we are quite involved
14 actually as a group. There are quite a few of us.

15 MS. SPOEL: Thank you. I think those are
16 all my questions.

17 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Ms. Spoel. I
18 think we have come to a point where we don't have any
19 more examiners to cross-examine.

20 MR. B. CAMPBELL: So we can conclude
21 Panel 10?

22 THE CHAIRMAN: No, unfortunately, that is
23 not true. I suppose it is attribute to the cooperation
24 of all the parties involved that this is a fairly rare
25 occasion, but we now are adjourning until Monday

1 morning at ten o'clock.

2 THE REGISTRAR: Please come to order.

3 This hearing will adjourn until Monday morning next at
4 ten o'clock.

5 ---Whereupon the hearing was adjourned at 11:28 a.m.,
6 to be reconvened on Monday, June 15, 1992, at
10:00 a.m.

7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25 JAS/JTO [c. copyright 1985]



3 1761 11468152 1

